

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 22, '93.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

YESTERDAY THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,

at Harrisburg, had a calm, but interesting discussion of the Dukes' case.

It is without precedent and it is therefore fitting that members should "go slow" in reaching a decision.

It is to be remembered that although Dukes' crimes are of the most heinous known to the land, that although he is universally believed to be unfit to associate with gentlemen, he has been brought before the bar of justice and a jury of his countrymen has acquitted him.

His character may be as black as the imagination can conceive, he may be guilty of seduction, and of every act of immorality known, but his conviction is wanting to complete the record in order to allow the legislature, on these grounds, to constitutionally expel him.

There was a somewhat similar case in this county not long ago, when a young lawyer, who was guilty of seduction, but whose case was not brought to trial, was sought by the decent members of the Bucks county legal fraternity to be disgraced.

The supreme court held, according to our recollection, that no conviction having been made that the private character of a man was not to be inquired into so long as his actions were not detrimental to the interests of his clients and the public.

Upon similar grounds we presume the Dukes' case will be tried in the Legislature. The people of his district have chosen him to represent them in the Legislature.

He is convicted of no crime, and if he chooses to take his seat, and does no act which would deprive his constituents of a representation in the House, deplorable as it is, we cannot see how his infamous acts can be brought to bear against him.

It is the part of wisdom to look beyond this case and see what might follow if a member can be arbitrarily declared vacant by a majority of the House.

As Mr. Sponsler, the member from Perry county, said yesterday,

"Revolution may hang upon the precedent that we shall now establish. We sit here as the supreme power of the State. In proportion to the dignity and greatness of these houses, so should our actions be careful and discreet. Although modeled after the English Houses of Parliament we differ from the latter in one important particular. They have no written Constitution to control them—we have."

Their action is modeled by venerable precedents, any one of which can be withdrawn by a majority. One of the constitutional disqualifications of a member of this House is conviction of an "infamous crime." The crimes that law for more than a century has called "infamous" are bribery, perjury and embezzlement. For conviction of any of these crimes, or for being a dupe or an agent in these crimes, or for nothing else can this House prevent a person taking the oath of membership. Therefore if this man comes here with even a blacker character than that which he has and I confess it is hard to imagine one blacker, we cannot under the Constitution expel him. We may establish precedent that is violative of the Constitution. If upon the floor, this man Dukes insults the presiding officer, or by disorderly conduct while in our midst assails the dignity of the House, we can expel him for contempt, but recollect that in what is here proposed we are attempting to reach an act done outside of this House, a thing for which a court of justice itself would not have the right to disbar a member, though it might upon the ground of immoral conduct. We are not a court of justice in that sense. When you come to the question of moral turpitude, who is to say that this man has been guilty of greater moral turpitude than another man? In a time of wild passion or partisan feeling a precedent such as the one now suggested might be seized upon to subvert the will of the people."

Mr. McReynolds, from this county, in behalf of the Committee on Judiciary General, reported that, in the committee's opinion, the seat of Dukes "can and should be declared vacant."

He said N. J. Dukes has, after the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session of the House of Representatives, failed to be qualified as a member of the House of Representatives, as required by the Constitution, thereby depriving his constituents and his fellow members of his services without leave of the House of Representatives, and if he has been guilty of such immoral and infamous conduct as would render him unfit to occupy his seat as a member of the House of Representatives.

The committee therefore requested of the House the power to send for persons and papers and investigate the failure of Dukes to appear and qualify as a member and whether he had been guilty of "such immoral and infamous conduct as will justify the committee in recommending that his seat be declared vacant and a new election ordered."

If the failure to appear and qualify before the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session without leave, is a valid reason for a member's expulsion, the difficulty in coming to a conclusion in this case is removed, and on this ground, without going into any discussion of his conduct, his seat can be properly declared vacant.

T. Kirk Hulme, Esq., has gone to Dakota. He expects to grow up with the country.—Bristol Gazette.

Dakota is a pretty big country; how much does the GAZETTE expect it to "grow up" and is Mr. Hulme expected to "grow up" as the country increases in bigness?—Dopplestein Democrat.

Yes. Why not?

Fitful and treacherous are its traditional characteristics. It is the month of evil deeds that blows hot and cold and plays fast and loose at the same time.

There is an old English and Scottish proverb which says: "March borrow—three days of April and they are ill."

In Windsor Park, London, about four o'clock on Saturday afternoon, Lady Florence Dixie was attacked by two men disguised in women's clothes. Her dress was cut with daggers in several places, but she received no severe injury.

Lady Florence was walking in a secluded spot near the woods, when the two men asked her what time it was. She replied that she had no watch, and afterwards noted that though they were women's clothes their faces had been shaven. Much alarmed, she started to walk away, and was followed by the men, one of whom seized her. She struggled to escape, but seeing their daggers, fell in a swoon and did not recover for three quarters of an hour after.

She remained greatly prostrated all Sunday, and the details of the event could not be elicited fully. The saving of her life is attributed to her St. Bernard dog, which it is supposed protected her while she lay in a swoon.

Lady Florence had no reason to suspect immediate danger, although she had been somewhat fearful since the receipt of letters about the Land League. The last thing she remembers is one of the men pushing a quantity of mud into her mouth.

On her recovery she found that both palms were cut across and her gloves severed. There were two dagger holes, two inches apart, in the right breast of her dress. A broad steel corset rib had been broken by the weapon, which had penetrated to the inner lining of her dress at the first stroke, and to her corset at the second stroke.

Lady Florence supposes that she unconsciously struggled with the men, assisted by her dog, until the scoundrels were disturbed by a cart passing the woods. She received threatening letters while in Ireland recently. One of the men wore a green dress and a large hat with a veil. This outrage is of the Phoenix Park order, and the only cause for it not resulting in a terrible murder was the protection of the faithful dog and the approach of the man in a cart.

The facts that the royal park at Windsor was the scene, and Lady Florence Dixie the victim, coupled with the circumstances that the lady has recently made serious charges against Mr. Parnell and his associates, will create a very uneasy feeling. It is just possible that the British Government may feel called upon to take some very decisive steps, and there are but few persons who would be disposed to blame them in the premises.

A terrific explosion of dynamite occurred in the local government board offices in Westminster, London, at nine o'clock last Thursday night, destroying much property. The report was heard in the House of Commons and caused much alarm. It is believed to be a deliberate attempt to blow up the government offices, the explosion being the subject of consultation in the House of Commons, Sir William Harcourt said he did not think it would be right to say anything about the matter until an official inquiry had been made. He had heard that in attempt had been made to blow up the Times office, but that no injury had been done. The explosion was heard at a distance of two or three miles. Witnesses evoked a mixture of surprise and indignation. The force of the explosion shot large portions of the masonry across the street. An examination shows that the case and contents of explosive material used in the attempt to blow up the Times office are exactly similar to those found after the recent explosion in Glasgow. It was no doubt the work of the Fenians or Invincibles. The police is being strengthened and every precaution taken. No arrests have been made.

The astounding result of the trial of Dukes for the murder of Captain Nutt, cashier of the Pennsylvania Treasury and father of a ruined daughter, will confirm suspicion that the jurors were affected by their partisan relations to the accused. Like Dukes, the twelve men are all Democrats, while Captain Nutt was an ardent Republican. It is not our purpose to intimate that the verdict was influenced by the political predilections of the jurors, but rather to call attention to the fact that the political complexion of the jury was marked as a suspicious circumstance when the trial began. Heretofore it has not been considered necessary in criminal cases to inquire into a juror's party relations before deciding whether to challenge him, but the Dukes trial may change the practice of lawyers. Whatever their bias, the twelve men have certainly acquitted a man who, in the opinion of Judge Wilson, the magistrate before whom he was tried, and of the majority of the community of which he was the tragic death of Captain Nutt he was a highly respected member, ought to expiate an atrocious crime upon the gallows.

The Supreme Court of Georgia decides that the fact that a Judge of the Superior Court had formerly been a director of a railroad company, and was so at the time that an attorney rendered professional services to the company, does not disqualify him from presiding at the trial of a suit for such services, if at that time he had ceased to be a director, owned no stock, and was not otherwise interested.

Queen Victoria, on Saturday last, slipped on the stairs at Windsor and severely injured her knee. It is believed that she will be confined to her room for some time, and owing to her age and the somewhat delicate condition of her health some dangerous complications may arise from them.

Dr. Morgan Dix of Trinity Church, New York, is giving a course of Lenten lectures on Woman, which are making a marked impression upon fashionable circles. This is especially true of the lectures on divorce and co-education. Dr. Dix taking decided ground for educating the two sexes at different institutions. His lectures are to be published in book form.

"What is promised to the righteous?" asked a mild and amiable Sunday school teacher of a small child at the end of her class. "Eternal bliss," quickly responded the child. "Quite right, my dear child," said the mild and amiable. "And now tell me what is promised to the wicked?" "Eternal blister, ma'am," was the prompt reply. The teacher pronounced it theologically correct, but peculiarly expressed.

Anna Kantz, of Goshen, Ind., had been lame for a year, and could not walk, except with crutches. Dr. Cullis, the fair-haired man in Boston, wrote to her, saying that on the 29th of February, at 3 o'clock he would pray for her immediate restoration to perfect soundness. A little before 3 o'clock she tried to walk, but her troublesome foot gave her such excruciating pain when she put it to the floor that she sat down in her easy chair and read a few Psalms from the Bible. To her surprise and joy, she found at 3 o'clock that she was able to walk without her crutches and without pain. One of the most remarkable features of this alleged faith cure is that the difference in time between Boston and Goshen was of no account. Dr. Cullis, paying by Boston time and Miss Kantz by Goshen time, were according to the clock at Goshen. This is one of the mysteries of faith cure which we may be able to explain. The difference is about an hour.

To charge licentiousness on Protestantism, as Dr. Dix does, is to ignore the well known statistics of morals. Licentiousness is the common sin of Roman Catholic France and Italy, while chastity is the national virtue of Protestant Germany and England. On the other hand, Puritan New England appears to be rapidly degenerating in morals, while the Roman Catholic population of America appears to be chaste and to preserve inviolate the family relation. Neither Church can exist a first stone at the other in this matter. The doctrine that marriage is a civil contract is a natural but gross reaction from the sacramental theory of the Middle Ages. It is indeed a divine ordinance, and equally divine whether the marriage ceremony be performed by a bishop, by a justice of the peace, or by the parties themselves. If, instead of attempting to get us all into the Holy Catholic Church, Dr. Dix would inaugurate a movement—moral, religious, but non-ecclesiastical, founded on the Bible but not on church decrees—to repeal the laws for the promotion of licentiousness euphemistically called "divorce laws," he would find ready to follow him enough men of all faiths, and forms, and creeds, to give some eventual hope of success.—Christian Union.

Last Sunday was Palm Sunday. From the Roman Catholic churches the congregation carried home a chip of palm or a sprig of evergreen. These were distributed to the worshippers in memorial of the waving of palm branches by the Jewish multitude to welcome Jesus as He rode on a colt into the city of Jerusalem. The excitement in regard to Jesus was at its height. It was Passover season, and devout Jews from every part of Judea and Galilee were at Jerusalem. Some looked on Jesus as a great prophet and a miraculous healer of diseases. Others regarded him as the coming "King of the Jews," who was to overthrow the Roman authority, and establish the Israelites in power under Himself as King. So they were ready to cry "Hosanna!" Many of the same people who composed this crowd of welcome were a few days later found among those who cried: "Away with Him! Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" The days between Palm Sunday and Raster are known as those of "Holy Week." Especially in the Roman Catholic and in many Episcopal churches the services are of thrilling interest and deep solemnity.

The Harpers, in order to encourage young American artists, have offered an award of \$3,000 for the best original drawing to illustrate Alfred Donnet's "Christmas Hymn." The artists must not be over twenty-five years old, and the successful competitor will be expected to use the money for the prosecution of art study. The drawing will be published in Harper's Magazine for December, 1883.

An Elder was cramped with an ache, St. Jacobs Oil did the pain slake; He was highly pleased, That again he was graced, And took a lot home to Salt Lake.

A soldier on guard at Fort Wayne, Was suddenly stricken with pain, He thought he was gone, But was rubbed on St. Jacobs Oil, Was all right again.

The handsome new edifice of the First New Jerusalem Church of Philadelphia was opened last week.

The Presbyterians opened a mission church in Rio Janeiro in 1892 and they have now 32 churches scattered over Brazil.

The land that stood Peter's dome brought in and stored his riches from God he could not free; He landed better than his kinsmen, The cross was slain to his glory.

It is said that the Rev. James Freeman Clarke has prepared a condensed Bible for use in the home, the school and the church, and that it will soon be issued by a New York publisher.

"Yes," said the Vermont clergyman, "I consider it all right for a minister of the gospel to trade horses, but as a matter of policy he should trade with some one outside of his own congregation."—Boston Post.

According to the Missionary Review, the Hindus "not only believe in probation in one state of existence after death, but they believe in 8,400,000 successive periods of existence, each beginning with birth and ending with death, and probation continued in each and all of them."

This is the right kind of spirit. At a dedication service the other day a brother said, "I have no money to give, I have got done giving to the Lord. I pay. I have some money that belongs to the Lord that I think he would have me pay him. You need not thank me, it costs me nothing; it was set apart to his work."—N. Y. Evening.

Dr. Morgan Dix of Trinity Church, New York, is giving a course of Lenten lectures on Woman, which are making a marked impression upon fashionable circles. This is especially true of the lectures on divorce and co-education. Dr. Dix taking decided ground for educating the two sexes at different institutions. His lectures are to be published in book form.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 22, '93.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

YESTERDAY THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,

at Harrisburg, had a calm, but interesting discussion of the Dukes' case.

It is without precedent and it is therefore fitting that members should "go slow" in reaching a decision.

It is to be remembered that although Dukes' crimes are of the most heinous known to the land, that although he is universally believed to be unfit to associate with gentlemen, he has been brought before the bar of justice and a jury of his countrymen has acquitted him.

His character may be as black as the imagination can conceive, he may be guilty of seduction, and of every act of immorality known, but his conviction is wanting to complete the record in order to allow the legislature, on these grounds, to constitutionally expel him.

There was a somewhat similar case in this county not long ago, when a young lawyer, who was guilty of seduction, but whose case was not brought to trial, was sought by the decent members of the Bucks county legal fraternity to be disgraced.

The supreme court held, according to our recollection, that no conviction having been made that the private character of a man was not to be inquired into so long as his actions were not detrimental to the interests of his clients and the public.

Upon similar grounds we presume the Dukes' case will be tried in the Legislature. The people of his district have chosen him to represent them in the Legislature.

He is convicted of no crime, and if he chooses to take his seat, and does no act which would deprive his constituents of a representation in the House, deplorable as it is, we cannot see how his infamous acts can be brought to bear against him.

It is the part of wisdom to look beyond this case and see what might follow if a member can be arbitrarily declared vacant by a majority of the House.

As Mr. Sponsler, the member from Perry county, said yesterday,

"Revolution may hang upon the precedent that we shall now establish. We sit here as the supreme power of the State. In proportion to the dignity and greatness of these houses, so should our actions be careful and discreet. Although modeled after the English Houses of Parliament we differ from the latter in one important particular. They have no written Constitution to control them—we have."

Their action is modeled by venerable precedents, any one of which can be withdrawn by a majority. One of the constitutional disqualifications of a member of this House is conviction of an "infamous crime." The crimes that law for more than a century has called "infamous" are bribery, perjury and embezzlement. For conviction of any of these crimes, or for being a dupe or an agent in these crimes, or for nothing else can this House prevent a person taking the oath of membership. Therefore if this man comes here with even a blacker character than that which he has and I confess it is hard to imagine one blacker, we cannot under the Constitution expel him. We may establish precedent that is violative of the Constitution. If upon the floor, this man Dukes insults the presiding officer, or by disorderly conduct while in our midst assails the dignity of the House, we can expel him for contempt, but recollect that in what is here proposed we are attempting to reach an act done outside of this House, a thing for which a court of justice itself would not have the right to disbar a member, though it might upon the ground of immoral conduct. We are not a court of justice in that sense. When you come to the question of moral turpitude, who is to say that this man has been guilty of greater moral turpitude than another man? In a time of wild passion or partisan feeling a precedent such as the one now suggested might be seized upon to subvert the will of the people."

Mr. McReynolds, from this county, in behalf of the Committee on Judiciary General, reported that, in the committee's opinion, the seat of Dukes "can and should be declared vacant."

He said N. J. Dukes has, after the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session of the House of Representatives, failed to be qualified as a member of the House of Representatives, as required by the Constitution, thereby depriving his constituents and his fellow members of his services without leave of the House of Representatives, and if he has been guilty of such immoral and infamous conduct as would render him unfit to occupy his seat as a member of the House of Representatives.

The committee therefore requested of the House the power to send for persons and papers and investigate the failure of Dukes to appear and qualify as a member and whether he had been guilty of "such immoral and infamous conduct as will justify the committee in recommending that his seat be declared vacant and a new election ordered."

If the failure to appear and qualify before the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session without leave, is a valid reason for a member's expulsion, the difficulty in coming to a conclusion in this case is removed, and on this ground, without going into any discussion of his conduct, his seat can be properly declared vacant.

T. Kirk Hulme, Esq., has gone to Dakota. He expects to grow up with the country.—Bristol Gazette.

Dakota is a pretty big country; how much does the GAZETTE expect it to "grow up" and is Mr. Hulme expected to "grow up" as the country increases in bigness?—Dopplestein Democrat.

Yes. Why not?

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 22, '93.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

YESTERDAY THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,

at Harrisburg, had a calm, but interesting discussion of the Dukes' case.

It is without precedent and it is therefore fitting that members should "go slow" in reaching a decision.

It is to be remembered that although Dukes' crimes are of the most heinous known to the land, that although he is universally believed to be unfit to associate with gentlemen, he has been brought before the bar of justice and a jury of his countrymen has acquitted him.

His character may be as black as the imagination can conceive, he may be guilty of seduction, and of every act of immorality known, but his conviction is wanting to complete the record in order to allow the legislature, on these grounds, to constitutionally expel him.

There was a somewhat similar case in this county not long ago, when a young lawyer, who was guilty of seduction, but whose case was not brought to trial, was sought by the decent members of the Bucks county legal fraternity to be disgraced.

The supreme court held, according to our recollection, that no conviction having been made that the private character of a man was not to be inquired into so long as his actions were not detrimental to the interests of his clients and the public.

Upon similar grounds we presume the Dukes' case will be tried in the Legislature. The people of his district have chosen him to represent them in the Legislature.

He is convicted of no crime, and if he chooses to take his seat, and does no act which would deprive his constituents of a representation in the House, deplorable as it is, we cannot see how his infamous acts can be brought to bear against him.

It is the part of wisdom to look beyond this case and see what might follow if a member can be arbitrarily declared vacant by a majority of the House.

As Mr. Sponsler, the member from Perry county, said yesterday,

"Revolution may hang upon the precedent that we shall now establish. We sit here as the supreme power of the State. In proportion to the dignity and greatness of these houses, so should our actions be careful and discreet. Although modeled after the English Houses of Parliament we differ from the latter in one important particular. They have no written Constitution to control them—we have."

Their action is modeled by venerable precedents, any one of which can be withdrawn by a majority. One of the constitutional disqualifications of a member of this House is conviction of an "infamous crime." The crimes that law for more than a century has called "infamous" are bribery, perjury and embezzlement. For conviction of any of these crimes, or for being a dupe or an agent in these crimes, or for nothing else can this House prevent a person taking the oath of membership. Therefore if this man comes here with even a blacker character than that which he has and I confess it is hard to imagine one blacker, we cannot under the Constitution expel him. We may establish precedent that is violative of the Constitution. If upon the floor, this man Dukes insults the presiding officer, or by disorderly conduct while in our midst assails the dignity of the House, we can expel him for contempt, but recollect that in what is here proposed we are attempting to reach an act done outside of this House, a thing for which a court of justice itself would not have the right to disbar a member, though it might upon the ground of immoral conduct. We are not a court of justice in that sense. When you come to the question of moral turpitude, who is to say that this man has been guilty of greater moral turpitude than another man? In a time of wild passion or partisan feeling a precedent such as the one now suggested might be seized upon to subvert the will of the people."

Mr. McReynolds, from this county, in behalf of the Committee on Judiciary General, reported that, in the committee's opinion, the seat of Dukes "can and should be declared vacant."

He said N. J. Dukes has, after the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session of the House of Representatives, failed to be qualified as a member of the House of Representatives, as required by the Constitution, thereby depriving his constituents and his fellow members of his services without leave of the House of Representatives, and if he has been guilty of such immoral and infamous conduct as would render him unfit to occupy his seat as a member of the House of Representatives.

The committee therefore requested of the House the power to send for persons and papers and investigate the failure of Dukes to appear and qualify as a member and whether he had been guilty of "such immoral and infamous conduct as will justify the committee in recommending that his seat be declared vacant and a new election ordered."

If the failure to appear and qualify before the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session without leave, is a valid reason for a member's expulsion, the difficulty in coming to a conclusion in this case is removed, and on this ground, without going into any discussion of his conduct, his seat can be properly declared vacant.

T. Kirk Hulme, Esq., has gone to Dakota. He expects to grow up with the country.—Bristol Gazette.

Dakota is a pretty big country; how much does the GAZETTE expect it to "grow up" and is Mr. Hulme expected to "grow up" as the country increases in bigness?—Dopplestein Democrat.

Yes. Why not?

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 22, '93.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

YESTERDAY THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,

at Harrisburg, had a calm, but interesting discussion of the Dukes' case.

It is without precedent and it is therefore fitting that members should "go slow" in reaching a decision.

It is to be remembered that although Dukes' crimes are of the most heinous known to the land, that although he is universally believed to be unfit to associate with gentlemen, he has been brought before the bar of justice and a jury of his countrymen has acquitted him.

His character may be as black as the imagination can conceive, he may be guilty of seduction, and of every act of immorality known, but his conviction is wanting to complete the record in order to allow the legislature, on these grounds, to constitutionally expel him.

There was a somewhat similar case in this county not long ago, when a young lawyer, who was guilty of seduction, but whose case was not brought to trial, was sought by the decent members of the Bucks county legal fraternity to be disgraced.

The supreme court held, according to our recollection, that no conviction having been made that the private character of a man was not to be inquired into so long as his actions were not detrimental to the interests of his clients and the public.

Upon similar grounds we presume the Dukes' case will be tried in the Legislature. The people of his district have chosen him to represent them in the Legislature.

He is convicted of no crime, and if he chooses to take his seat, and does no act which would deprive his constituents of a representation in the House, deplorable as it is, we cannot see how his infamous acts can be brought to bear against him.

It is the part of wisdom to look beyond this case and see what might follow if a member can be arbitrarily declared vacant by a majority of the House.

As Mr. Sponsler, the member from Perry county, said yesterday,

"Revolution may hang upon the precedent that we shall now establish. We sit here as the supreme power of the State. In proportion to the dignity and greatness of these houses, so should our actions be careful and discreet. Although modeled after the English Houses of Parliament we differ from the latter in one important particular. They have no written Constitution to control them—we have."

Their action is modeled by venerable precedents, any one of which can be withdrawn by a majority. One of the constitutional disqualifications of a member of this House is conviction of an "infamous crime." The crimes that law for more than a century has called "infamous" are bribery, perjury and embezzlement. For conviction of any of these crimes, or for being a dupe or an agent in these crimes, or for nothing else can this House prevent a person taking the oath of membership. Therefore if this man comes here with even a blacker character than that which he has and I confess it is hard to imagine one blacker, we cannot under the Constitution expel him. We may establish precedent that is violative of the Constitution. If upon the floor, this man Dukes insults the presiding officer, or by disorderly conduct while in our midst assails the dignity of the House, we can expel him for contempt, but recollect that in what is here proposed we are attempting to reach an act done outside of this House, a thing for which a court of justice itself would not have the right to disbar a member, though it might upon the ground of immoral conduct. We are not a court of justice in that sense. When you come to the question of moral turpitude, who is to say that this man has been guilty of greater moral turpitude than another man? In a time of wild passion or partisan feeling a precedent such as the one now suggested might be seized upon to subvert the will of the people."

Mr. McReynolds, from this county, in behalf of the Committee on Judiciary General, reported that, in the committee's opinion, the seat of Dukes "can and should be declared vacant."

He said N. J. Dukes has, after the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session of the House of Representatives, failed to be qualified as a member of the House of Representatives, as required by the Constitution, thereby depriving his constituents and his fellow members of his services without leave of the House of Representatives, and if he has been guilty of such immoral and infamous conduct as would render him unfit to occupy his seat as a member of the House of Representatives.

The committee therefore requested of the House the power to send for persons and papers and investigate the failure of Dukes to appear and qualify as a member and whether he had been guilty of "such immoral and infamous conduct as will justify the committee in recommending that his seat be declared vacant and a new election ordered."

If the failure to appear and qualify before the expiration of three-fourths of the regular session without leave, is a valid reason for a member's expulsion, the difficulty in coming to a conclusion in this case is removed, and on this ground, without going into any discussion of his conduct, his seat can be properly declared vacant.

T. Kirk Hulme, Esq., has gone to Dakota. He expects to grow up with the country.—Bristol Gazette.

Dakota is a pretty big country; how much does the GAZETTE expect it to "grow up" and is Mr. Hulme expected to "grow up" as the country increases in bigness?—Dopplestein Democrat.

Yes. Why not?

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 22, '93.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

YESTERDAY THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,

at Harrisburg, had a calm, but interesting discussion of the Dukes' case.

It is without precedent and it is therefore fitting that members should "go slow" in reaching a decision.

It is to be remembered that although Dukes' crimes are of the most heinous known to the land, that although he is universally believed to be unfit to associate with gentlemen, he has been brought before the bar of justice and a jury of his countrymen has acquitted him.

His character may be as black as the imagination can conceive, he may be guilty of seduction, and of every act of immorality known, but his conviction is wanting to complete the record in order to allow the legislature, on these grounds, to constitutionally expel him.

There was a somewhat similar case in this county not long ago, when a young lawyer, who was guilty of seduction, but whose case was not brought to trial, was sought by the decent members of the Bucks county legal fraternity to be disgraced.

The supreme court held, according to our recollection, that no conviction having been made that the private character of a man was not to be inquired into so long as his actions were not detrimental to the interests of his clients and the public.

Upon similar grounds we presume the Dukes' case will be tried in the Legislature. The people of his district have chosen him to represent them in the Legislature.

He is convicted of no crime, and if he chooses to take his seat, and does no act which would deprive his constituents of a representation in the House, deplorable as it is, we cannot see how his infamous acts can be brought to bear against him.

It is the part of wisdom to look beyond this case and see what might follow if a member can be arbitrarily declared vacant by a majority of the House.

As Mr. Sponsler, the member from Perry county, said yesterday,

"Revolution may hang upon the precedent that we shall now establish. We sit here as the supreme power of the State. In proportion to the dignity and greatness of these houses, so should our actions be careful and discreet. Although modeled after the English Houses of Parliament we differ from the latter in one important particular. They have no written Constitution to control them—we have."

Their action is modeled by venerable precedents, any one of which can be withdrawn by a majority. One of the constitutional disqualifications of a member of this House is conviction of an "infamous crime." The crimes that law for more than a century has called "infamous" are bribery, perjury and embezzlement. For conviction of any of these crimes, or

